UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/750,001	12/29/2000	Scott M. Frank	BS00-428	6605	
7590 09/26/2007 THOMAS, KAYDEN, HORSTEMEYER & RISLEY, LLP/ AT&T BLS Intellectual Property, Inc. 100 GALLERIA PARKWAY SUITE 1750			EXAM	EXAMINER	
			OUELLETTE, JONATHAN P		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
ATLANTA, GA 30339		3629			
	,		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/26/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
•		09/750,001	FRANK ET AL.
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
		Jonathan Ouellette	3629
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
A SH WHIO - Exte after - If NO - Faili Any	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAtensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period ware to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	•		
2a) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 Set</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro	
Disposit	ion of Claims		
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>86-103</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>86-103</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.	
Applicat	ion Papers		
10)	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the lidrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is object.	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
а)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage
Attachmer	nt(s)		
2) Notic 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate

Application/Control Number: 09/750,001

Art Unit: 3629

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

 The Request filed on 9/7/2007 for Continued Examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114 based on parent Application No. 09/750,001 is acceptable and a RCE has been established. An action on the RCE follows.

Response to Amendment

2. Claims 1-85 and 104-109 have been cancelled; therefore Claims 86-103 are currently pending in application 09/750,001.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. <u>Claims 86-103</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Hunter (US 6,298,327) in view of Eggleston et al. (US 6,061,660).
- 5. As per **independent Claims 86, 92, and 98**, Hunter discloses a computer-readable medium containing a program for use with a computer (apparatus, method) for tracking innovations as part of a system for managing protection and licensing of intellectual property assets

Art Unit: 3629

(abstract, Fig.2, Fig.8), the program comprising: receiving intellectual property asset protection data (inventive disclosure, C2-C5), wherein the intellectual property asset protection data includes protection data corresponding to a plurality of intellectual property assets, wherein each intellectual property asset is defined and maintained as an asset by the existence of legally-enforceable intellectual property protection rights pertaining to that intellectual property asset (C8 L1-11, inventive disclosure, inventive identity, established date of invention or conception), wherein the intellectual property asset protection data further includes data related to a plurality of innovation disclosures, each innovation disclosure associated with one of a plurality of innovators (system tracks multiple inventions from multiple inventors); determining participation data for each of a plurality of innovator classes (C3 L53-67, invention categorized with specific technology group); and storing the intellectual property asset protection data has in an intellectual property asset protection database including a plurality of intellectual property asset protection data records (C2-C5, Fig.2, database).

6. While Hunter does disclose tracking innovations, inventors, and inventor related information (C11 L48-57, C18 Table 3), Hunter fails to expressly disclose receiving disclosure gift information associated with each innovation disclosure of the plurality of innovation disclosures; responsive to receiving the disclosure gift information associated with each innovation disclosure of the plurality of innovation disclosures, and automatically updating an associated balance of stocked disclosure gifts.

Application/Control Number: 09/750,001

Art Unit: 3629

- 7. Eggleston discloses the creation of employee incentive programs, which include tracking/automated fulfillment of non-monetary reward distribution data to include sponsor and award databases (Fig.20, C8 L13-20, C31 L25-67, C32 L1-20, C45-C46).
- 8. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included receiving disclosure gift information associated with each innovation disclosure of the plurality of innovation disclosures; responsive to receiving the disclosure gift information associated with each innovation disclosure of the plurality of innovation disclosures, and automatically updating an associated balance of stocked disclosure gifts, as disclosed by Eggleston in the system disclosed by Hunter, for the advantage of providing a method for tracking innovations with the ability to increase effectiveness of the system by offering/tracking all facets of innovations submission process, to include compensating/awarding the innovation submitter.
- 9. As per Claims 87, 93, and 99, Hunter discloses <u>tracking and reporting costs associated with</u> the <u>purchase of disclosure gifts</u> (C45-C46, sponsor and award database).
- 10. As per Claims 88, 94, and 100, Hunter discloses <u>tracking and reporting information arranged</u>
 by innovator regarding all disclosure gifts sent to each innovator of the plurality of
 innovators (C45 L27-50, consumer/participant database).
- 11. As per Claims 89, 95, and 101, Hunter discloses <u>automatically totaling numbers of disclosure</u> gifts distributed within a time period (C45-C46, sponsor and award database information/ aggregation of information based on date).

Art Unit: 3629

- 12. As per Claims 90, 96, and 102, Hunter and Eggleston fail to expressly show wherein the plurality of innovator data, including employee/contractor status and a management /non-management status.
- 13. However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive data and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The method for tracking innovation disclosures by an organization would be performed regardless of the type of innovator data stored. Thus, this descriptive data will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).
- 14. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a plurality of innovator data, to include: employee/contractor status and a management /non-management status, because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.
- 15. As per Claims 91, 97, and 103, while Hunter does disclose storing organization data associated with the innovator (Para0109, type of originator), Hunter fails to expressly show the organization data related to the innovator and including at least one of affiliate organization, company, division, and business unit.
- 16. However these differences are only found in the nonfunctional descriptive data and are not functionally involved in the steps recited. The method for tracking innovation disclosures by an organization would be performed regardless of the type of innovator descriptive data used. Thus, this descriptive data will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in

Art Unit: 3629

terms of patentability, see In re Gulack, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); In re Lowry, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994).

17. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included a innovator descriptive data (organization al date) to include: at least one of affiliate organization, company, division, and business unit, because such data does not functionally relate to the steps in the method claimed and because the subjective interpretation of the data does not patentably distinguish the claimed invention.

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments filed 9/7/2007 regarding Claims 86-103 have been considered, but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

- 19. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan Ouellette whose telephone number is (571) 272-6807. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8am 5:00pm.
- 20. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on (571) 272-6812. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned (703) 872-9306 for all official communications.
- 21. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-5484.

Application/Control Number: 09/750,001

Art Unit: 3629

September 14, 2007

ONATHAN OUT LANINER 3800
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3800